

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-23, 25, 26 and 51-79 are now pending in the application. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10, 12-23, 14-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that it unclear how a "register file," which is a data/software file, can include hardware components. Initially, Applicants respectfully note that the term "file" does not necessarily indicate a software file. For example, as described in Paragraph [003] of the specification, "register file" may refer to a collection of general purpose registers. As such, the term "register file" as recited in the claims refers to structure that can include hardware components.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicants amended the claims to recite "a register system" simply to facilitate prosecution.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 14-23, 57-58 and 60-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaggar (U.S. Pat. No. 5,701,493) in view of Shelor (U.S. Pat. No. 7,024,544). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledges that Jaggar fails to disclose "a plurality of encoders, a respective one of the encoders for each of the input ports." Instead, the Examiner relies on Shelor to disclose this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that Shelor is not a valid prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/468,802, filed May 7, 2003. Shelor has a filing date of June 24, 2003. In other words, the effective filing date of the present application predates the filing date of Shelor. As such, Shelor is not a valid prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that the presently pending claims should be allowable for at least the above reasons.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 4, 2007

By:   
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino  
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/dms